

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	2:23-cv-06302-HDV-AJR	Date	June 18, 2025
Title	Mark Snookal v. Chevron USA, Inc., et al.		

Present:	Hon. A. Joel Richlin, U.S. Magistrate Judge		
Claudia Garcia-Marquez		N/A	
Deputy Clerk		Court Reporter / Recorder	
Attorneys for Plaintiff(s):		Attorneys for Defendant(s):	
N/A		N/A	

**Proceedings (In Chambers):** ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S *EX PARTE* APPLICATION AS MOOT (DKT. 47)

On March 31, 2025, Plaintiff filed an *Ex Parte* Application for Leave to File a Motion to Compel Further Discovery (the “*Ex Parte* Application”). (Dkt. 47.) On April 2, 2025, Defendant filed an Opposition to the *Ex Parte* Application (the “Opposition”). (Dkt. 49.) On April 9, 2025, the Court held an informal discovery conference to discuss certain discovery disputes raised by Plaintiff in the *Ex Parte* Application. (Dkt. 51.) The Court subsequently held several additional informal discovery conferences and issued several orders to assist the parties in resolving these disputes. (Dkts. 53, 55, 57, 62.) The parties have now resolved the last remaining discovery dispute. Accordingly, the Court DENIES the *Ex Parte* Application as moot. The Court also denies the *Ex Parte* Application in the alternative because Plaintiff did not comply with the Court’s requirement to request an informal discovery conference before filing the application. The Court requires the parties to request an informal discovery conference before filing a discovery motion in an effort to save the parties time and money on motion practice. Indeed, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16 expressly recognizes the efficacy of requiring a pre-filing conference with the Court. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(3)(B)(v); Committee Notes on 2015 Amendment to Rule 16 (“Many judges who hold such conferences find them an efficient way to resolve most discovery disputes without the delay and burdens attending a formal motion, but the decision whether to require such conferences is left to the discretion of the judge in each case.”).

IT IS SO ORDERED.